UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/672,535	09/26/2003	Yigal Bejerano	Y.BEJERANO 3-16-1-49-1	3739	
47394 HITT GAINES	7590 03/17/200 , PC	8	EXAMINER		
ALCATEL-LUCENT			BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R		
PO BOX 83257 RICHARDSON	=		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2155		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/17/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@hittgaines.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Interview Summary	10/672,535	BEJERANO ET A Art Unit 2155 N/A. of an agreement laim amendment maybe the restored. 3) define the televould render the devould render the formula of the second payon of the second payo	AL.			
interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	BENJAMIN R. BRUCKART	2155				
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):					
(1) <u>BENJAMIN R. BRUCKART</u> .	(3)					
(2) <u>Joel Justiss, Reg No. 48,981</u> .	(4)					
Date of Interview: <u>26 February 2008</u> .						
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conference c)⊡ Personal [copy given to: 1)⊡ applicant 2	²)∏ applicant's representative	·]				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.					
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> .						
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>Suurballe</u> .						
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	I/A.				
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner and applicant discussed the proposed claim amendments and discussesion was directed to several issues. 1) the idea of a primary QoS versus what maybe the restoration path that was proposed. 2) Defining QoS to have some weight. QoS path is not directly defined. 3) define the two weights to be more specific and 4) defining what a suitable pimary path is. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.						
Evaminar Nota: Vou must sign this form upless it is an	/saleh najjar/ SPE AU 2155	rod				
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an	Examiner's signature, if require	red				